



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/659,951 | 09/10/2003 | Todd Allen Berg | 293/029Cont3 | 5856 |

1473 7590 11/14/2007
ROPES & GRAY LLP
PATENT DOCKETING 39/361
1211 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036-8704

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

THALER, MICHAEL H

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3731

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

11/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/659,951

Applicant(s)

BERG ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Thaler

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/10/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 13, 2007 has been entered.

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (6,120,432) in view of Dakov (6,030,392). Sullivan, in figures 1-13, discloses an apparatus for cutting an aperture in a side wall of a blood vessel comprising a curvable delivery sheath (e.g. 210), a tissue-piercing structure 250, a resilient structure 252 mounted on the tissue-piercing structure and being resiliently biased to spring radially outwardly (col. 5, lines 46-52) and curvable tissue-cutting catheter 220 (which is inherently a tissue cutting catheter when the distal end is tapered to a very sharp and thin edge at 222 as seen in figure 5 and described in col. 4, lines 56-60). The tissue-cutting catheter 220 is configured for rotation about the longitudinal axis of the tissue piercing structure for two independent reasons. First, the entire apparatus shown in figure 2 (including the tissue-cutting

Art Unit: 3731

catheter and the tissue-piercing structure) is clearly inherently configured for rotation about the longitudinal axis of the tissue piercing structure, by for example, manually rotating the entire apparatus about that axis. Second, (and in regard to claim 6) the tissue-cutting catheter 220 is freely slidable over the other members in both the longitudinal and circumferential directions as evidenced by the absence of any structure on the other members which would prevent such movement. Sullivan discloses only one resilient structure 252 rather than a plurality of resilient structures as claimed. However, Dakov, in figures 30-33, teaches that a plurality of resilient structures (barbs at 408) should be used to obtain the advantage of positively anchoring the end of a wire 406 to a blood vessel. It would have been obvious to include a plurality of resilient structures on the end of the Sullivan wire 250 so that it too would have this advantage.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (6,120,432) in view of Dakov (6,030,392) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of van der Gaast (3,577,979). Sullivan fails to disclose the cutting edge as being serrated. However, van der Gaast teaches that a circular cutting edge of a surgical punch should be serrated in order to obtain the advantage of reducing tearing of

Art Unit: 3731

the tissue (col. 2, lines 35-39). It would have been obvious to make the Sullivan cutting edge serrated so that it too would have this advantage.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,416,527. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the slight differences between the claims are obvious differences.

Art Unit: 3731

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Thaler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4704. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

mht



MICHAEL THALER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3731